UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/547,063	01/24/2006	Gregor Dudziak	104917-2-WCG	6170	
27386 7590 01/27/2009 NORRIS, MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A. 875 THIRD AVE 18TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10022			EXAMINER		
			MENON, KRISHNAN S		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/27/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Occurrence	10/547,063	DUDZIAK ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Krishnan S. Menon	1797				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 De	ecember 2008.					
	action is non-final.					
<i>,</i> —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3 and 5-22</u> is/are pending in the app	olication.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>8-11 and 20-22</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-7 and 12-19</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) DNotice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	ite					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:						
1	,					

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-3 and 5-22 are pending as amended 12/11/08, of which claims 8-11 and 20-22 are withdrawn.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims <u>1-3,5-7</u> and <u>12-19</u> are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The newly added limitation in claim 1, "consisting essentially a mesoporous ceramic membrane" does not appear to have support in the specification or original claims. Applicant's specification does not rule out other materials in the membrane.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

1. Claims 1-3,5,6 and 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over, Van 'T Veen et al (US 5,089,299).

Application/Control Number: 10/547,063 Page 3

Art Unit: 1797

Van 'T Veen teaches a hydrophobic ultrafiltration and hyperfiltration membranes with ceramic support and hydrophobic coating as claimed – see abstract, column 3, lines 18-34, and column 6, lines 27-34. The reference does not use the terminology "nanofiltration" but hydperfiltration range encompasses nanofiltration, as is clear from the pore sizes described, as well as it being known in the art. The hydrophobic coating is silanes – see column 4, lines 18-36. The substrate is ceramic – column 3, lines 5-12. The various types of siloxanes recited are also taught by the reference. Regarding 'consisting essentially ceramic membrane', the reference teaches the materials of the membrane layer and the support as ceramic (see column 2, line 64 – column 3, line 12), and thus meets this limitation. It is noted that applicant's mesoporous membranes also appear to have been made by having coating ceramic material on ceramic support – see pages 1-4 of the specification.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van 'T Veen in combination with Hying et al (US 6,383,386).

Van 'T Veen teaches hydrophobic nanofiltration membranes as shown above in paragraph 1.

Hying teaches ceramic hydrophobic membranes (abstract) with pore size ranging from 1 nm to 500 nm, the hydrophobing being conducted by known hydrophobing methods and includes silanes containing fluorine – see column 4, line 51 – column 5, line 8.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of these references to arrive at applicant's invention because the combination would have predictable results. See KSR Int'I. v. Teleflex Inc., 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1732, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1390 (2007). "it is commonsense that familiar items have obvious uses beyond their primary purposes, and a person of ordinary skill often will be able to fit the teachings of multiple patents together like pieces of a puzzle". "The combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results."

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/11/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Arguments regarding the Van 'T Veen reference is addressed in the rejection. Argument traversing the combination of Van 'T Veen and Hying is not persuasive: elimination of the hydrophobic coating in Van 'T Veen is not contemplated in the rejection.

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krishnan S. Menon whose telephone number is 571-272-1143. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David R. Sample can be reached on 571-272-1376. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/547,063 Page 6

Art Unit: 1797

/Krishnan S Menon/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797